

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/538,181	02/01/2006	Noriyuki Yamamoto	273067US6PCT	1827	
22850 N. 97590 100802008 OBLOOK, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			LEE, WILSON		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2163		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/03/2008	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

# Application No. Applicant(s) 10/538,181 YAMAMOTO ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit Wilson Lee 2163 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. s D

- Failu Any	re to reply within the set or extended period for rep	statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ly will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
tatus		
1)	Responsive to communication(s) fi	led on
2a)□	This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This action is non-final.
3)	Since this application is in conditio	n for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
	closed in accordance with the pract	tice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
isposit	on of Claims	
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the	application.
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is	are withdrawn from consideration.
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	
	Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected.	
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restr	iction and/or election requirement.
pplicati	on Papers	
9)	The specification is objected to by t	he Examiner.
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/ar	e: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any ob-	ection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	ng the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)	The oath or declaration is objected	to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.
riority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	
12)🖾	Acknowledgment is made of a clair	n for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)	All b) Some * c) None of:	
	1. Certified copies of the priorit	y documents have been received.
	2. Certified copies of the priorit	y documents have been received in Application No
	3. Copies of the certified copie	s of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
	application from the Internat	ional Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* 5	See the attached detailed Office act	ion for a list of the certified copies not received.

Other:
Paper No(s)/Mail Date  Notice of Informal Patent Application
Interview Summary (PTO-413)

Application/Control Number: 10/538,181

Art Unit: 2163

## Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a test of whether the invention is categorized as a process, machine, manufacture or composition or matter and if the invention produces a useful, concrete and tangible result. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) are found to be non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding Claims 1-12, all the "means" are software components that fails to constitute a hardware apparatus. They fail to fall within any patentable categories: process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, as set forth in 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility.

Regarding Claim 14, "recording medium" should be specified that it is a recording storage medium in order to distinguish it from a carrier signal medium. Also, it lacks a processor to execute the computer readable program. Since computer readable program is a software, it needs to be executed by a processor in order to perform the steps.

Regarding Claim 15, "program" should be specified that it is a "computerimplemented program" in order to distinguish it from a manual program and hand-script Application/Control Number: 10/538,181

Art Unit: 2163

program. It also lacks a storage medium to store the "program" and a processor to execute the "program".

#### Double Patenting.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Omum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3,73(b).

Claims 1-15 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of copending Application No. 11/514,255. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because, for instances, preference information inherently indicating good or bad preference as negative factors, attribute information is obvious to be independently from each other. Other limitations in the claims are similar or the same to the claims 1-13 of copending Application No. 11/514,255.

Application/Control Number: 10/538,181

Art Unit: 2163

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

#### IDS

References cited in IDS dated 6/9/05 have been crossed through because they are duplicate reference cited in IDS dated 3/20/07.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chatani (US 2004/0073625) discloses a method and system for providing evaluation of text-based products. See [0002], [0009], [0030].

Julliard et al. (US 2004/0034631) discloses a shared document repository with coupled recommender system. See [0005], [0011].

Brandenberg et al. (US 2004/0032393) discloses a method and apparatus for scheduling presentation of digital content on a personal communication device. See [0569], [0571], [0646].

Castellani et al. (US 2004/0019846) discloses a system and method for managing document retention of shared documents. See [0002], [0004], [0028].

Lam et al. (US 2003/0220858) discloses a method and system for collaborative vendor reconciliation. See [0016].

## Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Wilson Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-1824.

Papers related to the application may be submitted by facsimile transmission.

Any transmission not to be considered an official response must be clearly marked "DRAFT". The official fax number is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

9/24/08

/Wilson Lee/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2163